

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF NORTHAMPTON COUNTY,
PENNSYLVANIA

BRUCE PETRIE, GINGER PETRIE,
LAWRENCE OPTHOF, MARGARET
OPTHOF, FRANK PALUMBO, ROBERT
McKELLIN and CYNTHIA McKELLIN,

Appellants,

v.

LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP

Appellee,

and

BETHLEHEM LANDFILL COMPANY,

Intervenor.

CIVIL DIVISION - LAW

C-48-CV-2023-00335

NOTICE OF APPEAL TO
COMMONWEALTH COURT

Filed on behalf of:
Intervenor, Bethlehem Landfill Company


Counsel of Record for This Party:

Maryanne Starr Garber, Esquire
Pa. I.D. No. 82795
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC
Two Liberty Place
50 S. 16th Street, Suite 3200
Philadelphia, PA 19102
(215) 665-5379
maryanne.garber@bipc.com

*Attorney for Intervenor, Bethlehem Landfill
Company*

COPY

Respectfully submitted:



Maryanne Starr Garber, Esquire (ID No. 82795)

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Two Liberty Place

50 S. 16th Street, Suite 3200

Philadelphia, PA 19102

(215) 665-5379

maryanne.garber@bipc.com

Attorney for Intervenor, Bethlehem Landfill Company

Dated: June 6, 2023

Exhibit A

hearing held on December 21, 2022. Appellants asserted that the Township failed to meet the necessary statutory requirements prior to enacting the Ordinance.

3. As the matter before the Court is a procedural challenge, we note the following procedural history: on October 5, 2022, Bethlehem Landfill Company submitted a request to Lower Saucon Township to amend the Township's Zoning Ordinance to rezone approximately 275 acres adjacent to BLC's existing landfill from Rural Agricultural (RA) to Light Industrial (LI). BLC also sought additional text amendments to allow a greater portion of land designated for natural resource protection to be utilized for industrial purposes in the LI district, and to exempt landfills or waste disposal facilities from the Township's site plan approval process. See Appellant Exhibit 1.

4. The map and text amendments were presented to the Lower Saucon Township Council at the October 19, 2022 Council meeting. See Appellee Exhibit A. During the October 19, 2022 meeting, Township Council voted to prepare the proposed map and text amendments for review and public hearing. Council also voted to include an additional amendment to change landfills from a Special Exception Use to a Conditional Use in the LI District. See Appellee Exhibit C. Public hearing regarding the proposed ordinance was originally scheduled for December 7, 2022, however, at the Council meeting on November 16, 2022, the public hearing was rescheduled to December 21, 2022. See Appellee Exhibit B, C.

5. The map and text amendments were presented to the Lower Saucon Township Planning Commission on October 27, 2022, and the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval. See Appellee Exhibit D. On November 15, 2022, the Lower Saucon Township Environmental Advisory Committee voted to recommend that Council reject both the rezoning and the natural resource mitigation alternative as contained in the proposed ordinance. See Appellee Exhibit E.

6. The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission reviewed the map and text amendments at meetings held on November 15 and November 17, 2022. By letter dated November 18, 2022, the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission noted that the proposed amendments do not align with regional planning policies, and that the areas subject to the rezoning contain significant natural resources. See Appellee Exhibit F.

7. On November 14, 2022, Stacy Werkheiser, Administrative Assistant for the Township, emailed the Proposed Ordinance to the Northampton County Law Librarian, Lisa Mann,¹ including a notification of hearing for December 7, 2022. See Appellee Exhibit K. Ms. Mann testified that she received the November 14 email with the proposed ordinance and that she stamped the printout with a date and filed number, and placed it in the file to be available to the public. See Appellants Exhibit 2; N.T. 2/8/23 at 4-6. The proposed ordinance provided to Ms. Mann on November 14, 2022, and made available to the public, did not contain the amended maps and did not include an attestation. Id.; Appellee Exhibit K. Ms. Mann testified that she did not receive further communications or other versions of the proposed ordinance from the Township until she received the adopted ordinance from Ms. Werkheiser on January 3, 2023. N.T. 2/8/23 at 7. See Appellee Exhibit U.

8. On November 17, Mark Hudson, Township Manager, emailed Ms. Mann to advise that the public hearing was rescheduled from December 7 to December 21, 2022. See Appellee Exhibit K; Appellants Exhibit 3. The November 17 email attached the same version of the proposed ordinance as had been sent by Ms. Werkheiser, identified as “10/27/22 – Advertisement Version” and omitting the exhibits/maps. Id. On November 23, 2022, Mr. Hudson emailed Ms. Mann, stating that the previous draft ordinances provided to the Law Library incorrectly included the wrong public hearing date (December 7 instead of December 21). See Appellee Exhibit L. The

¹ We note that all emails from the Township were addressed to “Lynn Mann,” however did include at Lisa Mann’s correct email address of lmann@northamptoncounty.org.

November 23, 2022 email included updated attachments, identified as “11/17/2022-DRAFT,” and included two maps. Id. The draft emailed on November 23, 2022 did not include an attestation. Id. Ms. Mann testified that she did not receive this email. N.T. 2/8/23 at 11.

9. On November 28, 2022 and December 5, 2022, the Township published notice of the December 21, 2022 public hearing in the Express-Times newspaper. See Appellee Exhibit H. The legal notice, with a copy of the text of the proposed ordinance, identified as “10/27/22 – Advertisement Version” was emailed to the Express-Times on November 18, 2022. Id. On November 23, 2022, the Township emailed the Express-Times a corrected version of the text of the proposed ordinance, identified as “11/17/2022-DRAFT.” See Appellee Exhibit I. Neither submission included the exhibits/maps as part of the proposed ordinance. See Appellee Exhibit H-I.

10. On November 18, 2022, the Township mailed notice of the proposed zoning changes to the owners of the seven parcels subject to the rezoning, which included five parcels owned by the Bethlehem Landfill Company, and two parcels owned by Dennis and Christine Hahn. See Appellee Exhibit J. Notices were also posted at the subject properties themselves. Id.

11. Public Hearing on the proposed ordinance was held on December 21, 2022. See Appellee Exhibit S. At the conclusion of the hearing, Council voted 3-2 to enact the zoning ordinance.

12. On January 3, 2023, Stacy Werkheiser emailed the adopted ordinance, No. 2022-02, to the Northampton County Law Library. See Appellee Exhibit U.

13. Appellants initiated the instant appeal on January 13, 2023.

14. The relevant provision of the Judicial Code states:

(a) Applicability; court of common pleas.--

(1) This section shall apply to any appeal raising questions relating to an alleged defect in the process of or procedure for enactment or adoption of any ordinance, resolution, map or similar action of a political subdivision.

(2) An appeal pursuant to this section shall be to the court of common pleas.

(b) Appeals of defects in statutory procedure.--

(1) Any appeal raising questions relating to an alleged defect in statutory procedure shall be brought within 30 days of the intended effective date of the ordinance.

...

(d) Presumptions.--Notwithstanding any other provision of law, appeals pursuant to this section shall be subject to and in accordance with the following:

(1) An ordinance shall be presumed to be valid and to have been enacted or adopted in strict compliance with statutory procedure.

...

(3) An ordinance shall not be found void from inception unless the party alleging the defect in statutory procedure meets the burden of proving the elements set forth in subsection (e).

(e) Burden of proof.--Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an ordinance shall not be found void from inception except as follows:

(1) In the case of an appeal brought within the 30-day time limitation of subsection (b), the party alleging the defect must meet the burden of proving that there was a failure to strictly comply with statutory procedure.

42 Pa.C.S.A. § 5571.1.

15. Where a challenge to the procedural validity of an ordinance is filed within thirty days of the ordinance's effective date, a challenger must only prove that the municipality failed to strictly comply with statutory procedures, not that prejudice resulted from such failure. Davis-Haas v. Exeter Twp. Zoning Hearing Bd., 166 A.3d 527 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2017).

16. The statutory procedures for the valid enactment of a zoning ordinance are set forth in the Municipalities Planning Code at Sections 609-610.² Here, Appellants assert that the Township failed to strictly comply with the notice and publication requirements of Section 610:

(a) Proposed zoning ordinances and amendments shall not be enacted unless notice of proposed enactment is given in the manner set forth in this section, and shall include the time and place of the meeting at which passage will be considered, a reference to a place within the municipality where copies of the proposed ordinance or amendment may be examined without charge or obtained for a charge not greater than the cost thereof. The governing body shall publish the proposed ordinance or amendment once in one newspaper of general circulation in the municipality not more than 60 days nor less than 7 days prior to passage. Publication of the proposed ordinance or amendment shall include either the full

² We note that Appellants have not asserted that the Township failed to comply with the procedural requirements of Section 609, which includes provisions for mailing notices, posting notices, and submissions to planning agencies.

text thereof or the title and a brief summary, prepared by the municipal solicitor and setting forth all the provisions in reasonable detail. If the full text is not included:

- (1) A copy thereof shall be supplied to a newspaper of general circulation in the municipality at the time the public notice is published.
- (2) An attested copy of the proposed ordinance shall be filed in the county law library or other county office designated by the county commissioners, who may impose a fee no greater than that necessary to cover the actual costs of storing said ordinances.

53 P.S. § 10610.

17. With regard to the notice published in the Express-Times, Appellants note the following deficiencies: (1) the notice provided only the title of the proposed ordinance and failed to identify the lands being rezoned; (2) the notice did not include either the full text or a brief summary prepared by the solicitor “setting forth all the provisions in reasonable detail”; (3) the notice did not include “reference to a place within the municipality where copies of the proposed ordinance or amendment may be examined without charge or obtained for a charge not greater than the cost thereof”; and (4) the notice references the ability to review text amendments but does not refer to the ability to review proposed map amendments.

18. In response, the Township and BLC argue that the notice published in the Express-Times on November 28, 2022 and December 5, 2022 satisfied the above-cited statutory requirements. The published notices were as follows:

The Lower Saucon Township Council will hold a public hearing for the consideration of and possible adoption and enactment of Ordinance No. 2022-02, “AN ORDINANCE OF THE TOWNSHIP OF LOWER SAUCON, NORTHAMPTON COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA, AMENDING AND REVISING THE CODE OF THE TOWNSHIP OF LOWER SAUCON BY AMENDING CHAPTER 180 (ZONING) TO REVISE THE ZONING MAP BY CHANGING APPROXIMATELY 275.70 ACRES OF LAND FROM AN RA ZONING DESIGNATION TO AN LI ZONING DESIGNATION, REVISING SECTION 180-79.1 TO ADD “LANDFILLS AND WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITIES USE TO THE LIST OF USES REQUIRING CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL IN THE LI ZONING DISTRICT, REVISING SECTION 180-80B TO REMOVE THE LANDFILLS AND WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITIES USES FROM THE LIST OF USES REQUIRING SPECIAL EXCEPTION APPROVAL, REVISING SECTIONS 180-101 AND 180-109F TO EXEMPT LANDFILLS AND WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITIES FROM THE SITE PLAN APPROVAL PROCESS AND REQUIREMENTS IF THE USE WILL REQUIRE LAND DEVELOPMENT APPROVAL UNDER THE LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE AND A PERMIT FROM THE PENNSYLVANIA

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, AND ADDING SECTION 180-109G TO PROVIDE FOR A NATURAL RESOURCE MITIGATION ALTERNATIVE IN THE LI DISTRICT WHEN APPROVED IN WRITING BY THE COUNCIL OF LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP; AND REPEALING ALL OTHER ORDINANCES AND PARTS OF ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT WITH THE PROVISIONS CONTAINED HEREIN. THIS ORDINANCE CONTAINS SIGNIFICANT, SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES TO THE LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP ZONING MAP AND ZONING REGULATIONS, AND SHOULD BE REVIEWED IN ITS ENTIRETY FOR A COMPREHENSIVE UNDERSTANDING OF ITS PROVISIONS.” on Wednesday, December 21, 2022, at 6:30 p.m. at Council’s regular business meeting to be held at Town Hall, 3700 Old Philadelphia Pike, Bethlehem, PA 18015. A copy of the full text may be viewed at the Lower Saucon Township municipal building during normal business hours. Mark Hudson, Township Manager.

See Appellee Exhibit H.

19. With regard to the specificity of the above notice, there is no dispute that the notice does not contain the full text of the proposed ordinance, and therefore required “the title and a brief summary, prepared by the municipal solicitor and setting forth all the provisions in reasonable detail.” The published notice contains only the title of the proposed ordinance, and not a summary thereof, as required by § 10610(a). BLC and the Township argue that the title of the ordinance is sufficiently detailed to satisfy the summary requirement, and rely on Streck v. Lower Macungie Twp. Bd. of Comm'rs, 58 A.3d 865 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2012) for the standard of how detailed a summary must be.³ However, the published notice in Streck did include a plain language summary reviewing the provisions of the proposed ordinances changes. Here, there is no summary included in the published notice,⁴ and the title of the proposed ordinance does not make it apparent to a reader that, at a minimum, the proposed changes involve rezoning agricultural land for industrial use. As noted by the Court in Streck, although the MPC does not require the summary to explain the purpose of

³ We note that in Streck, the only procedural deficiency found by the trial court in invalidating the ordinance at issue therein was the alleged lack of reasonable detail in the summary within the published notice.

“[The] trial court did not find that any of these steps [of Section 6109a)] were omitted. Stated otherwise, the Township strictly complied with each of these procedural requirements. Cf. [Hawk v. Eldred Twp. Bd. of Supervisors, 983 A.2d 216, 220 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2009)] (noting that measures taken by the township to publicize its ordinance and to invite public input did not strictly comply because, inter alia, it made the text of the ordinance available on the internet but not at a specific ‘place within the municipality,’ such as the library).” 58 A 3d at 876.

⁴ Section 610 also requires that the summary be prepared by the solicitor. Here, there is no summary, and it is impossible to make an evidentiary determination from the record as to who prepared the notice for publication, although we note that the notice bears the name of Mark Hudson, Township Manager, not the Township’s solicitor.

the proposed amendments, it is important to identify the content of the proposed amendment, rather than just identifying technical section numbers. Id. at 878. The Court further noted, “[t]he summary gave the reader notice that there would be a major rezoning of land located within the Township, and it advised any citizen interested in more information on where to obtain a free copy of the new zoning map and the complete text of [the ordinance].” Id. The instant notice additionally failed to state that both the text and map were available for public examination without cost, and confusingly stated that the public hearing would be held at the address identified as “Town Hall,” while stating that the text amendments could be viewed at the “municipal building.”

20. Based on the foregoing, the Court finds that the Township failed to strictly comply with the requirements of 53 P.S. § 10610(a) in enacting Zoning Ordinance No. 2022-02.

21. Section 610(a)(1) of the MPC further requires, if the full text of a proposed ordinance is not published, a copy of the proposed ordinance be “supplied to a newspaper of general circulation in the municipality at the time the public notice is published.” 53 P.S. § 10610(a)(1). The record reflects that on November 18, 2022, the Township emailed the text of the proposed ordinance to the Express-Times in conjunction with the request to publish the legal notice. See Appellee Exhibit H. However, the email included the incorrect version of the proposed ordinance, and further did not include the exhibits/maps that were part of the zoning amendment. On November 23, 2022, the Township emailed the Express-Times a corrected version of the text of the proposed ordinance, but still did not include the exhibits or maps identifying the parcels that would be affected by the rezoning covered in the proposed ordinance. See Appellee Exhibit I.

22. BLC and the Township argue that 53 P.S. § 10610(a)(1) does not require that maps be included in the submission to the newspaper. However, we note that the text of the ordinance refers to the maps as being “attached hereto and incorporated herein” which leads to the necessary conclusion that the text of the ordinance is incomplete without the inclusion of the maps. Further,

the text of the ordinance, in the absence of the maps, does not otherwise identify the specific lands subject to rezoning and the public would not be able to ascertain which land would be affected without reference to the maps.

23. Based on the foregoing, the Court finds that the Township failed to strictly comply with the requirements of 53 P.S. § 10610(a)(1) in enacting Zoning Ordinance No. 2022-02.

24. Lastly, Section 610(a)(2) of the MPC requires, if the full text of a proposed ordinance is not published, that “[a]n attested copy of the proposed ordinance shall be filed in the county law library or other county office designated by the county commissioners, who may impose a fee no greater than that necessary to cover the actual costs of storing said ordinances.” 53 P.S. § 10610(a)(1). The record reflects that the only email actually received by the Law Librarian with regard to the proposed ordinance was the November 14, 2022 email from Stacy Werkheiser.⁵ See Appellee Exhibit K; N.T. 2/8/23 at 4-6. This email included both an incorrect version of the proposed ordinance, and the incorrect date for the public hearing, as it was later moved from December 7 to December 21, 2022. See Appellee Exhibit K. This email also did not include the maps/exhibits which were part of the proposed ordinance, and it was not an attested copy. Id. Thus, the only version of the proposed ordinance that was made available to the public at the Northampton County Law Library was incomplete, later amended to update the hearing date, and unattested.

25. We cannot agree with the Township/BLC that the above was sufficient to satisfy the statutory requirements regarding the availability of the proposed ordinance. In particular, the attestation requirement of Section 610(a)(2) cannot be considered an irrelevant requirement when

⁵ The Township/BLC argue that the subsequent email from Mark Hudson on November 23, 2022, corrected any deficiencies, by including the correct version of the proposed ordinance, identifying the correct hearing date, and attaching the exhibits/maps. See Appellee Exhibit L. However, the testimony of Ms. Mann, the law librarian, was that she never received this email. N.T. 2/8/23 at 7, 11. Therefore, this correct version of the ordinance, along with the correct hearing date, were not available to the public at the law library. We additionally note that even if the November 23, 2022 email had been received and properly filed in the law library, the proposed ordinance was still not an “attested copy” as clearly required by MPC Section 610(a)(2).

the legislature explicitly and unambiguously requires that “an attested copy of the proposed ordinance” be filed with the county law library or similar government office, while simultaneously not requiring the same of the copy provided to the newspaper. The Township failed to strictly comply with the requirements of 53 P.S. § 10610(a)(2) in enacting Zoning Ordinance No. 2022-02.

26. The argument by the Township/BLC that the public had sufficient constructive notice, as demonstrated by high public turnout at the December 21, 2022 hearing and organized opposition, is similarly unavailing. It is clear that the standard of strict compliance with statutory procedures is not reduced by actual or constructive notice to affected parties. See Davis-Hass, supra.⁶ As noted in Davis-Haas, because the challenge was filed within thirty days, the Appellants are not required to demonstrate any prejudice; they can sustain their burden by demonstrating that a statutory requirement was not met. Here, the Township did not strictly comply with the statutory procedures prior to adopting Lower Saucon Township Ordinance No. 2022-02, as addressed above, and the Ordinance is held to be void *ab initio*.

BY THE COURT:



_____,
ABRAHAM P. KASSIS, J.

⁶ In Davis-Haas, the Commonwealth Court affirmed the invalidating of a zoning ordinance on procedural grounds arising from deficiencies similar to those raised herein, despite argument that the affected landowner had actual notice of the zoning change at issue. “If a published notice fails to satisfy the statutory requirements, the fact that members of the public, or even the appellants themselves, appeared at the hearing does not breathe life into an otherwise void ordinance.” Id. at 551 (citing Lower Gwynedd Twp. v. Gwynedd Properties, Inc., 591 A.2d 285, 287 (Pa. 1991)).

Exhibit B

PROTHONOTARY OF NORTHAMPTON COUNTY

Holly Ruggiero
Prothonotary



Melissa P. Rudas, Esq.
Solicitor

BRUCE PETRIE (et al)
vs
LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP

Case Number
C-48-CV-2023-00335

Case Participants

Plaintiff

LAWRENCE OPTHOF

MARGARET OPTHOF

BRUCE PETRIE

GINGER PETRIE

FRANK PALUMBO

ROBERT MCKELLIN

CYNTHIA MCKELLIN

2700 REDDINGTON ROAD

HELLERTOWN, PA18055

2700 REDINGTON ROAD

HELLERTOWN, PA18055

2626 REDINGTON ROAD

HELLERTOWN, PA18055

2626 REDINGTON ROAD

HELLERTOWN, PA18055

2566 KINGS MILL ROAD

HELLERTOWN, PA18055

2166 KISTLER AVENUE

HELLERTOWN, PA18055

2166 KISLER AVENUE

HELLERTOWN, PA18055

Defendant

LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP

3700 OLD PHILADELPHIA PIKE

BETHLEHEM, PA18015

Attorney (Defendant)

B LINCOLN TREADWELL, JR, ESQ

915 WEST BROAD STREET

6108667711

2ND FLOOR

BETHLEHEM, PA18018

GEORGE A HEITCZMAN, ESQ

18 EAST MARKET STREET

6106915500

BETHLEHEM, PA18018

Attorney (Plaintiff)

GARY N ASTEAK, ESQ

726 WALNUT STREET

6102582901

EASTON, PA18042

Attorney (Defendant)

MARYANNE STARR GARBER, ESQ

LAND AIR WATER LEGAL SOLUTIONS

850 CASSATT RD

100 BERWYN PARK SUITE 210

BERWYN, PA19312

Intervenor (Defendant)

LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP COUNCIL

3700 OLD PHILADELPHIA PIKE

BETHLEHEM, PA18015

BETHLEHEM LANDFILL COMPANY

Attorney Relationships

Plaintiff Attorney

GARY N ASTEAK, ESQ
 GARY N ASTEAK, ESQ
 GARY N ASTEAK, ESQ
 GARY N ASTEAK, ESQ
 GARY N ASTEAK, ESQ
 GARY N ASTEAK, ESQ
 GARY N ASTEAK, ESQ

Plaintiff

LAWRENCE OPTHOF
 MARGARET OPTHOF
 BRUCE PETRIE
 GINGER PETRIE
 FRANK PALUMBO
 ROBERT MCKELLIN
 CYNTHIA MCKELLIN

Defendant Attorney

B LINCOLN TREADWELL, JR, ESQ
 GEORGE A HEITCZMAN, ESQ

Defendant

LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP
 LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP

Intervenor (Defendant) Attorney

B LINCOLN TREADWELL, JR, ESQ
 MARYANNE STARR GARBER, ESQ

Intervenor (Defendant)

LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP COUNCIL
 BETHLEHEM LANDFILL COMPANY

PROTHONOTARY DOCKET ENTRIES

Entry Date	Description	Pages
05/08/2023	ORDER AND REASONS DATED MAY 8, 2023, UPON CONSIDERATION OF THE PROCEDURAL VALIDITY CHALLENGE TO LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP ORDINANCE NO 2022-02, FILED BY APPELLANTS ON JANUARY 13, 2023, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND DECREED THAT APPELLANTS' PROCEDURAL CHALLENGE IS GRANTED AND LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP ORDINANCE NO 2022-02 IS HELD TO BE VOID AB INITIO KASSIS, JUDGE EO DIE EXIT NOTICE AND COPY TO COUNSEL AND/OR PARTIES OF RECORD PURSUANT TO RULE 236	10
04/18/2023	RESULT OF THE CALL OF THE ARGUMENT LIST-READY FOR ARGUMENT-JUDGE KASSIS	
04/17/2023	JOINT BRIEF OF LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP AND BETHLEHEM LANDFILL COMPANY IN OPPOSITION TO APPELLANTS' PROCEDURAL VALIDITY CHALLENGE WITH CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE FILED BY MARYANNE STARR GARBER, ESQ EO DIE EXIT TO COURT ADMIN	27
04/12/2023	JOINT BRIEF OF LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP AND BETHLEHEM LANDFILL COMPANY IN OPPOSITION TO APPELLANTS' PROCEDURAL VALIDITY CHALLENGE FILED BY B LINCOLN TREADWELL, JR, ESQ AND MARYANNE STARR GARBER, ESQ EO DIE EXIT TO COURT ADMIN	244
04/12/2023	JOINT BRIEF OF LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP AND BETHLEHEM LANDFILL COMPANY IN OPPOSITION TO APPELLANTS' PROCEDURAL VALIDITY CHALLENGE WITH CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE FILED BY B LINCOLN TREADWELL, ESQ AND MARYANNE STARR GARBER, ESQ EO DIE EXIT TO COURT ADMIN	25
04/12/2023	WITHDRAWAL OF APPEARANCE WITH CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE FILED BY ANDREW D KLEIN, ESQ	4
04/12/2023	WITHDRAWAL OF APPEARANCE OF APPEARANCE ON BEHALF OF THE INTERVENOR BETHLEHEM LANDFILL COMPANY FILED BY BRIGITTA F GLUNK, ESQ	4
04/06/2023	CIVIL ARGUMENT SCHEDULED FOR 4/18/2023 9 00 AM IN COURTROOM #1 WITH KASSIS, ABRAHAM - JUDGE	

03/29/2023	APPELLANTS' BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF LAND USE APPEAL FILED BY GARY NEIL ASTEAK, ESQ EO DIE EXIT TO COURT ADMIN	154
03/29/2023	APPELLANTS' BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF LAND USE APPEAL FILED BY GARY NEIL ASTEAK, ESQ EO DIE EXIT TO COURT ADMIN	19
03/10/2023	AMENDED CERTIFICATION OF RECORD FILED BY B LINCOLN TREADWELL, JR , ESQ	179
03/08/2023	PRAECIPE FOR THE ARGUMENT LIST FOR APRIL 18, 2023 FILED BY KASSIS, J EO DIE EXIT COPY TO COURT ADMIN	2
03/03/2023	ORDER OF COURT DATED MARCH 3, 2023 FILED WHEREIN IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND DECREED THIS MATTER SHALL BE PLACED ON THE ARGUMENT LIST OF APRIL 18, 2023 FOR DISPOSITION ALL PARTIES ARE ATTACHED FOR ORAL ARGUMENT, SPECIALLY SCHEDULED FOR APRIL 17, 2023 AT 10 00 AM KASSIS, JUDGE EO DIE EXIT NOTICE AND COPY TO COUNSEL OF RECORD PURSUANT TO RULE 236	1
03/01/2023	TESTIMONY OF LISA MANN HELD BEFORE THE HONORABLE EDWARD D REIBMAN, SENIOR JUDGE ON WEDNESDAY FEBRUARY 8, 2023 FILED	14
02/28/2023	PRAECIPE FOR MISCELLANEOUS HEARING LIST FOR MARCH 15, 2023 FILED BY GARY NEIL ASTEAK, ESQ EO DIE EXIT COPY TO COURT ADMIN	1
02/15/2023	ORDER OF COURT DATED FEBRUARY 15, 2023 FILED WHEREIN UPON REQUEST OF COUNSEL, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT THE ABOVE-REFERENCED MATTER IS GIVEN MAJOR CASE DESIGNATION AND ASSIGNED TO THE HONORABLE ABRAHAM P KASSIS FOR DISPOSTION KASSIS, JUDGE EO DIE EXIT NOTICE AND COPY TO COUNSEL OF RECORD PURSUANT TO RULE 236	1
02/09/2023	PRAECIPE FOR ENTRY OF APPEARANCE ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANT FILED BY GEORGE A HEITCZMAN, J D	2
02/08/2023	ORDER OF COURT DATED FEBRUARY 8, 2023 FILED WHEREIN UPON CONSIDERATION OF THE APPELLANTS' MOTION TO STAY COLLATERAL PROCEEDINGS FILED ON JANUARY 31, 2023, AND AFTER HEARING THEREON, IT IS ORDERED THAT SAID MOTION IS DENIED REIBMAN, SENIOR JUDGE EO DIE EXIT NOTICE AND COPY TO COUNEL OF RECORD PURSUANT TO RULE 236	1
02/08/2023	PETITION TO INTERVENE FILED BY LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP ZONING HEARING BOAD AND ORDER OF COURT DATED FEBRUARY 8, 2023 FILED WHEREIN THE PETITION TO INTERVENE FILED BY LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP ZONING HEARING BOARD IS GRANTED TO THE EXTENT THAT IT MAY PARTICIPATE IN THE HEARING ON THE MOTION FOR STAY FILED BY APPELLANTS REIBMAN, SENIOR JUDGE EO DIE EXIT NOTICE AND COPY TO COUNSEL OF RECORD PURSUANT TO RULE 236	3
02/08/2023	BETHLEHEM LANDFILL COMPANY'S MOTION TO STRIKE APPELLANTS' MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF A REQUEST FOR PERMANENT INJUNCTIVE RELIEF THAT IS NOT PROPERLY BEFORE THE COURT WITH CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE FILED BY ANDREW D KLINE, ESQ EO DIE EXIT JUDGES SHEET TO COURT ADMIN	50
02/08/2023	BRIEF OF BETHLEHEM LANDFILL COMPANY TO APPELLANTS' MOTION TO STAY COLLATERAL PROCEEDINGS WITH CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE FILED BY MARYANNE STARR GARBER, ESQ EO DIE EXIT TO COURT ADMIN	106
02/07/2023	CERTIFICATION OF RECORD FROM LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP FILED BY B LINCOLN TREADWELL, ESQ (FLASH DRIVES ATTACHED TO PLEADING)	653
02/02/2023	ENTRY OF APPEARANCE ON BEHALF OF LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP AND LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP COUNCIL FILED BY B LINCOLN TREADWELL, JR , ESQ	1
02/02/2023	NOTICE OF INTERVENTION OF LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP COUNCIL FILED BY B LINCOLN TREADWELL, JR , ESQ	4

01/31/2023	MOTION TO STAY COLLATERAL PROCEEDINGS/ RULE TO SHOW CAUSE FILED BY GARY NEIL ASTEAK, ESQ RULE RETURNABLE FOR FEBRUARY 9TH AT 11 AM IN COURTROOM 4 MUNLEY, JUDGE EO DIE RULE ISSUED	52
01/24/2023	ENTRY OF APPEARANCE ON BEHALF OF BETHLEHEM LANDFILL COMPANY WITH CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE FILED BY ANDREW D KLEIN, ESQ	3
01/24/2023	NOTICE OF INTERVENTION OF BETHLEHEM LANDFILL COMPANY WITH CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE FILED BY ANDREW D KLEIN, ESQ	3
01/17/2023	EXIT WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP VIA U S CERTIFIED MAIL RECEIPT NUMBER 7022 0410 0003 4573 2660	3
	CERTIFIED MAIL CARD RECEIVED ON 2/13/2023 @ 12 41 PM	
01/13/2023	PRAECIPE FOR ENTRY OF APPEARANCE ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANTS FILED BY GARY NEIL ASTEAK, ESQ	1
01/13/2023	FILE ONLY	
01/13/2023	NOTICE OF APPEAL FILED BY GARY NEIL ASTEAK, ESQ	56
Total Number of Pages		1,623

June 06, 2023

**IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF NORTHAMPTON COUNTY,
PENNSYLVANIA**

BRUCE PETRIE, GINGER PETRIE,	:	
LAWRENCE OPTHOF, MARGARET	:	
OPTHOF, FRANK PALUMBO, ROBERT	:	CIVIL DIVISION - LAW
McKELLIN and CYNTHIA McKELLIN,	:	
	:	C-48-CV-2023-00335
Appellants,	:	
	:	
vs.	:	
	:	
LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP,	:	
	:	
Appellee,	:	
	:	
and	:	
	:	
BETHLEHEM LANDFILL COMPANY,	:	
	:	
Intervenor.	:	

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I certify that this filing complies with the provisions of the *Public Access Policy of the Unified Judicial System of Pennsylvania Case Records of the Appellate and Trial Courts* that requires filing confidential information and documents differently than non-confidential information and documents.

Dated: June 6, 2023



Maryanne Starr Garber, Esquire (ID No. 82795)
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC
Two Liberty Place
50 S. 16th Street, Suite 3200
Philadelphia, PA 19102
(215) 665-5379
maryanne.garber@bipc.com
Attorney for Intervenor, Bethlehem

**IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF NORTHAMPTON COUNTY,
PENNSYLVANIA**

BRUCE PETRIE, GINGER PETRIE,	:	
LAWRENCE OPTHOF, MARGARET	:	
OPTHOF, FRANK PALUMBO, ROBERT	:	CIVIL DIVISION - LAW
McKELLIN and CYNTHIA McKELLIN,	:	
	:	C-48-CV-2023-00335
Appellants,	:	
	:	
vs.	:	
	:	
LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP,	:	
	:	
Appellee,	:	
	:	
and	:	
	:	
BETHLEHEM LANDFILL COMPANY,	:	
	:	
Intervenor.	:	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Maryanne Starr Garber, hereby certify that on this date a true and correct copy of the foregoing Notice of Appeal to Commonwealth Court was served upon the following via U.S. mail:

Gary Asteak, Esquire
Asteak Law Offices
726 Walnut Street
Easton, PA 18042
Counsel for Appellants

George A. Heitzman, Esquire
18 East Market Street
P.O. Box 1446
Bethlehem, PA 18016
*Counsel for Appellee Lower Saucon Township
Zoning Hearing Board*

Hon. Judge Abraham P. Kassis
Northampton County Courthouse
669 Washington Street
Easton, PA 18042

Official Court Reporter's Office of
Northampton County
669 Washington Street
Easton, PA 18042

J. Jermaine Greene, Sr.,
Northampton County Court Administrator
Office of Court Administration
669 Washington Street
Easton, PA 18042

B. Lincoln Treadwell, Esquire
915 W. Broad Street, 2nd Floor
Bethlehem, PA 18018
Counsel for Lower Saucon Township

Dated: June 6, 2023



Maryanne Starr Garber, Esquire (ID No. 82795)
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC
Two Liberty Place
50 S. 16th Street, Suite 3200
Philadelphia, PA 19102
(215) 665-5379
maryanne.garber@bipc.com
*Attorney for Intervenor,
Bethlehem Landfill Company*